

**R E M A R K S**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

**THE SPECIFICATION AMENDMENTS**

The specification was amended in the Amendment filed on July 13, 2006, to change "FIG. 8" to "FIG. 9" at page 18, lines 11 and 16, as required by the Examiner.

However, this amendment was not correct, since Fig. 8 (not Fig. 9) shows the internet download information referred to at page 18, lines 7-16. Accordingly, the specification has been amended to revert to the original (correct) reference to Fig. 8 at page 18, lines 11 and 16.

It is respectfully requested that the amendments to the specification be approved and entered.

**THE CLAIM REJECTION**

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner contends that claims 1-19 as amended in the Amendment filed on July 13, 2006, contain subject matter that is not supported by the disclosure in the original specification. Specifically, the Examiner has identified specific recitations in each of amended independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 that the Examiner contends are

unsupported by the original disclosure, and the Examiner has rejected claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-15 and 17-19 as being dependent on claims 1, 7, 13 and 16, respectively.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that (as described in detail hereinbelow) the recitations in amended independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 are in fact fully supported by the disclosure in the specification as pointed out in the Amendment filed on July 13, 2006. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC 112, is respectfully traversed. Independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 are addressed individually below.

Re: Claim 1

(A) The Examiner contends that the original disclosure does not support the recitation of "an address storage unit configured to store a plurality of addresses on the network set by a user in advance" (Examiner's emphasis). It is respectfully pointed out, however, that the original specification discloses setting up a plurality of URLs from which an HTML file is to be downloaded (page 17, lines 4-22, particularly lines 10-13), as shown in FIG. 8, for example, which shows a listing of URLs and a download time from each URL. As is well known, a URL is an address of a resource on the Internet. In addition, FIG. 18 shows a "specified site list" which stores a plurality of URLs as download destinations (see page 25, line 19 to page 26, line 2). Still

further, the specification discloses at page 17, lines 4-7 that the information shown in Fig. 8 is "set up preliminarily by a user." Thus, the original specification clearly supports storing a plurality of addresses on the network (URLs - Figs. 8 and 18, page 17, lines 10-13 and page 25, line 19 to page 26, line 2) set by a user in advance ("preliminarily by a user," page 17, lines 4-7).

(B) The Examiner further contends that the original disclosure does not support the recitation of "an information storage unit configured to store the information obtained by the information obtaining unit" where the information obtaining unit is "configured to obtain information on the network based on the addresses stored in the address storage unit." It is respectfully pointed out, however, that Fig. 9 clearly shows downloading data from a specified URL (step S16), and that Fig. 24 also shows downloading data from a specified URL (step S56). According to the disclosure in the specification at page 18, lines 17-18, the obtained HTML file is "stored in the DRAM 10". The specification also discloses storing downloaded data to, for example, a flash memory 18 of the digital camera at page 26, lines 8-25, describing Fig. 20. Thus, storing the downloaded information that has been obtained is clearly supported by the disclosure in the specification.

As shown in Fig. 9 and disclosed in the specification at page 18, lines 18-27, moreover, the downloading process does not end with obtaining one file from one URL (if more than one URL is specified). According to Fig. 9 and the disclosure in the specification at page 18, lines 18-27, after obtaining and storing information a URL counter is incremented and if the URL counter does not exceed the number of specified URLs, then data is downloaded from a specified URL (NO in step S20, leading to step S12), until data has been downloaded from all specified URLs (URL number counter exceeds the number of URLs, step S20). Fig. 24 also shows repeating downloading data from specified URLs (NO at step S60) until data has been downloaded from all specified URLs (URL number counter exceeds the number of URLs, step S20). Thus, Figs. 9 and 24 and the corresponding disclosure in the specification clearly show obtaining information from a plurality of URLs, and the specification clearly discloses storing the obtained information, as explained above. (See also page 17, line 27 to page 18, line 27 with respect to FIG. 19, and page 28, line 9 to page 29, line 13 with respect to FIG. 24.)

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the recitations of the information obtaining unit and the information storage unit in claim 1 are fully supported by the disclosure in the specification.

(C) The Examiner still further contends that the specification does not disclose "an adding unit configured to add the information stored in the information storage unit to the image stored in the image storage unit" (Examiner's emphasis). The specification discloses at page 18, lines 17-21, however, that the obtained HTML file is stored in the DRAM 10 temporarily (an example of an image storage unit, as described above) and that "the stored HTML is written into the comment region of the JPEG file as shown in FIG. 7 when an image is picked-up and stored in the flash memory 18 as a JPEG file." Thus, the specification explicitly states that the stored information obtained is added to an image. See also page 16, line 20 to page 17, line 3 and Fig. 7, which discloses HTML files and URL information about a plurality of HTML files, representing various data including world events, weather, news and information about popular songs, are added to the comment region of the JPEG image file. Still further, see page 29, line 15 to page 30, line 27 and Fig. 25.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended in the Amendment filed on July 13, 2006, including all of the recitations thereof pointed out by the Examiner, is clearly fully supported by the original disclosure in the specification and drawings.

Re: Claim 7

The Examiner contends that the recitations: (A) "reading a plurality of addresses on a network which are set by a user in advance" (Examiner's emphasis); (B) "storing the obtained information;" and (C) "adding the stored information to a picked up image" of claim 7 are unsupported by the original disclosure. It is respectfully submitted that recitations (A), (B) and (C) objected to by the Examiner in claim 7 are supported by the original disclosure in the specification and drawings at least for the reasons explained in items (A), (B) and (C) explained above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 as amended in the Amendment filed on July 13, 2006, including all of the recitations thereof pointed out by the Examiner, is also clearly fully supported by the original disclosure in the specification and drawings.

Re: Claim 13

The Examiner contends that the recitation "wherein the image recording unit adds the information, which is obtained from the server unit by the image recording unit through the network based on a plurality of addresses set by a user in advance" of claim 13 is not supported by the original disclosure (Examiner's emphasis).

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that the recitation of setting a plurality of addresses by a user in advance is fully supported by the disclosure in the original specification and drawings, as explained in item (A) above with respect to claim 1. In addition, it is respectfully pointed out that the recitation of obtaining information from the plurality of addresses set in advance is also fully supported by the disclosure in the original specification and drawings, as explained in item (B) above with respect to claim 1. For example, see Fig. 8 and the disclosure in the specification at page 17, lines 4-22 with respect to "preliminarily" setting by a user information including a plurality of URLs (addresses). In addition, see, for example, Fig. 9 and the disclosure in the specification at page 18, lines 9-11 with respect to downloading information from the plurality of URLs "preliminarily" set as shown in Fig. 8.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 as amended in the Amendment filed on July 13, 2006, including all of the recitations thereof pointed out by the Examiner, is also clearly fully supported by the original disclosure in the specification and drawings.

Re: Claim 16

The Examiner contends that the recitation "to obtain the information from the server unit through the network based on a

plurality of addresses set by a user in advance" of claim 16 is not supported by the original disclosure (Examiner's emphasis).

As pointed out above with respect to claim 13, however, it is respectfully pointed out that the recitation of setting a plurality of addresses by a user in advance and the recitation of obtaining information from the plurality of addresses set in advance are fully supported by the disclosure in the original specification and drawings.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 as amended in the Amendment filed on July 13, 2006, including all of the recitations thereof pointed out by the Examiner, is also clearly fully supported by the original disclosure in the specification and drawings.

\* \* \* \* \*

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 16, and claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-15 and 17-19 respectively depending therefrom, all fully comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection thereunder be withdrawn.

RE: THE OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to the amendments to the specification in the Amendment filed on July 13, 2006, on the grounds that the



subject matter added to pages 3, 4, 6, 7 and 10 (of the Amendment) is not supported by the original disclosure. The pages of the Amendment referred to by the Examiner are revisions of the Summary of the Invention to correspond to the amended claims. And it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the Summary of the Invention are fully supported by the disclosure in the original specification and drawings, as explained hereinabove with respect to the corresponding amendments to the claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

\* \* \* \* \*

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz  
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.  
220 Fifth Avenue - 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10001-7708  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
DH:iv